

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-8 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1 and 6-7 are independent. In the Office Action dated March 15, 2004, Claims 1 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Claims 2-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and the title was objected to. Following this response, Claims 1-6 remain in this application, Claims 7-8 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's objection rejections in turn.

I. Objection to the Title

In the Office Action dated March 15, 2004, the Examiner objected to the title as not being descriptive. The title has been amended, and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this objection and adds no new matter.

II. Amendment to the Specification

The specification has been amended to update the status of Japanese Patent Application No. 11-238775, which has been published. The publication number of Japanese Patent Application No. 11-238775 is 2001-067309. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment adds no new matter.

III. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,809,021 ("*Diaz*"). Claims 1 and 6 have been amended, and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter. Support for these amendments may be found in the specification at least at: page 17, lines 3-5; page 18, lines 12-19; page 19, lines 2-5; and page 22, lines 1-12. Claims 7 and 8 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art in that it recites, for example, "the bus including a signal line which indicates a completion of a current data transfer cycle on the bus", "the plurality nodes being connected to the signal line in a wired OR fashion", and "the sender node including a unit configured to stop the multi-cast transfer when the signal line is driven into an active state." Amended Claim 6 includes similar recitations.

In contrast, *Diaz* at least does not disclose any of the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Diaz* discloses a backpressure mechanism. (See col. 21, lines 5-9.) The disclosed backpressure mechanism, however, uses a backoff message instead of a signal line in the bus for sending a request to stop a data transfer. The backoff message comprises a source address (SA), designating a PBO destination 202, and a destination address (DA), designating a PBO source 200. (See FIG. 8a and FIG. 8b.) The backoff message packet is transmitted from the PBO destination 202 to the PBO source 200. On the other hand, the invention as recited in Claim 1 does not require packet transmission for stopping a multi-cast transfer. With embodiments of the present

invention, for example, a multi-cast transfer may be stopped by simply driving a signal line inside the bus. Furthermore, *Diaz* discloses "the backoff procedure initiated by destination 202 is repeated for other congesting sources." (See col. 21, lines 24-26.) In other words, the backpressure mechanism is used for stopping a data transfer from a PBO source 200 to a PBO destination 202 and not for stopping a multi-cast transfer.

In short, *Diaz* does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Diaz* at least does not disclose the bus including a signal line which indicates a completion of a current data transfer cycle on the bus, as recited by amended Claims 1. Amended Claim 6 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 6 patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 6.

Dependent Claims 2-5 are also allowable at least for the reasons above regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-5.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the

preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 10, 2004

By: 

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640
(404) 653-6559